

TOP SECRET

SECURITY INFORMATION

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
Washington 25, D.C.

JOINT SUBSIDIARY PLANS DIVISION

JCS Declassification/Release Instructions on File

SPDM-470-51
3 December 1951

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR POLICY COORDINATION:

Subject: CIA/OPC Strategic Plan.

1. Reference is made to our discussion of the subject at the 28 November meeting of the Representatives, and to SPDM-455-51, 23 November 1951, same subject. Because time did not permit full discussion of the plan at last Wednesday's meeting, you requested that such additional remarks as I might have be sent to you by memorandum. They follow:

2. General:

a. I note the statement that Part II "embodies all preparatory action required to facilitate the implementation of Parts III and IV." Since Parts III and IV have to do with wartime operations, it would seem that Part II should be submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for formal consideration. The broad dissemination required by that process is undesirable both from your point of view and from that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Moreover, it is noted that Part II does not give detailed preparatory measures for war, but rather guidance intended to meet that purpose as well as others. I conclude, therefore, that subject to the following Part II need not be reviewed formally by the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

(1) Preparatory action taken under Part II will conform with the requirements of Part IV as finally approved.

(incorporated in Part I, para. B., 2.)

(2) See paragraph 4 below.

b. Only two operations annexes have been attached. They deal with Psychological Warfare and with Economic Warfare, thus giving the impression that those are the principal activities contemplated. This does not appear to be in consonance with Section V, Paragraph C 2, which gives first priority to "harassing activity."

(Activities other than Psychological Warfare and Economic Warfare are not capable of general treatment for all areas.)

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3. Specific:

a. Part I, Paragraph B 4, last line. Change "supervision" to "command."

Reason: To conform with NSC 10/2.

(Revised)

b. Part II, Section II. This section has not been reviewed in detail, as it is assumed to be in consonance with approved national estimates.

c. Part II, Section III. This section has not been reviewed in detail, as it is assumed to be in consonance with approved national policy.

d. Part II, Section V C. This section has been commented on in SPDM-455-51. The following additional comments are offered:

(1) It is not clear why, in paragraph 2 a, Central Asia is included and East Germany and Austria are omitted.

(2) It is not clear why, in paragraph 2 b, Afghanistan is included, and India, Indonesia and Malaya are omitted. Since the situation is not static, it might be better not to list specific countries.

(3) It is recommended that paragraph 2 b include the caveat: "Every possible precaution will be taken to insure that the pattern of recruiting, organizing and coordinating activities in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization areas does not indicate that the United States lacks confidence that the line of the Rhine-Alps can be held." (See Enclosure "B" accompanying SPDM-104-50, 31 August 1950.)

(Section V has been revised and agreed upon.)

e. Part II, Section VII, Paragraph A 3. It should be understood that the priority given to this stockpiling is dependent on many factors, only one of which is the cold war requirement.

(Revised)

f. Part II, Section VIII. It is recommended that a paragraph be added providing for peacetime coordination with the military. (See Memorandum for Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, from DCI, dated 29 June 1951, subject: Coordination of CIA Activities with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and reply thereto.)

TOP SECRET (Incorporated)

TOP SECRET

SECURITY INFORMATION

g. Annex A. This has not been reviewed in detail, as it is assumed to be in consonance with approved national policy.

h. Annexes B and C. Time has not permitted a detailed review of these annexes.

i. Subparagraph (5), last page, Annex B. Change "Russians" to "Soviets."

Reason: To conform with present policy.

(Revised)

4. At a recent meeting of the PSB, and at the 28 November meeting of the Representatives, there were indicated certain DCI views on budgeting. I have not seen the views committed to writing, but understand them to be essentially as follows:

a. All OPC projects must be in conformity with the subject plan as finally approved.

b. Each project must be sponsored, either by State or Defense.

c. The sponsoring department must accept the responsibility of defending so much of the CIA budget as supports those projects.

The implications of this concept are too numerous to be studied here. It seems to me, however, that one result might well be a requirement for formal review by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the CIA/OPC Strategic Plan (Part II).

ARMAND HOPKINS,
Colonel, USA,
Acting Chief.

TOP SECRET